

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed July 26, 2005. Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 1, 3, 4 and 6 – 30 remain pending. In particular, Applicants have amended claims 1, 3, 4, 10, 15, 22 and 28, and have canceled claims 2 and 5 without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer. Applicants have canceled claims 2 and 5 merely to reduce the number of disputed issues and to facilitate early allowance and issuance of other claims in the present application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of these canceled claims in a continuing application, if Applicants so choose, and do not intend to dedicate the canceled subject matter to the public. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §101

The Office Action indicates that claims 22 – 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. As set forth above, Applicants have amended claim 22 and respectfully asserts that the rejection has been rendered moot.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action indicates that claims 1 – 6, 10 – 13, 15 – 16, 19 – 20, 22 – 23 and 26 - 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Baker* in view of *Krueger*. The Office Action further indicates that claims 7 – 9, 17 – 18 and 24 - 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Baker* in view of *Krueger* in view of *Naylor*. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections. The Office Action further indicates that claims 14 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over *Baker* in view of *Krueger* in view of *Nielsen*. With respect to claims 2 and 5, Applicants have canceled these claims and respectfully asserts that the rejection as to these claims has been rendered moot. With respect to the remaining claims, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

In this regard, Applicants respectfully agree with the contention in the Office Action indicating that *Baker* does not teach automatic sending of a revised document. Additionally, since *Baker* does not involve such sending, *Baker* also does not teach or reasonably suggest appending of information corresponding to an email address to the document that was sent via email. This is in direct contrast to the limitations recited in Applicants' amended claims.

With respect to *Krueger*, *Krueger* involves compiling a database of email addresses and sending revisions to a document to the email addresses of the database. However, similar to that of *Baker*, *Krueger* does not teach or reasonably suggest appending such information to a document that was sent via email.

In this regard, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite:

1. A method for sending documents, comprising:
determining whether a user sent a copy of a document, created by an application other than an email application, as an email attachment to a first set of at least one recipient via email; and
if the user sent the copy of the document to the at least one recipient of the first set as an email attachment using an email application, correlating information with the document so that a copy of a revised version of the document can be sent automatically as another email attachment to the at least one recipient of the first set without the user accessing the email application;
wherein correlating comprises encoding the document with the information, and the information comprises an email address of the at least one recipient of the first set to which the email attachment was sent via email.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully assert that the references are legally deficient for the purpose of rendering claim 1 unpatentable. In particular, Applicants respectfully assert that the cited references, either individually or in combination, do not teach or reasonably suggest at least

the features/limitations emphasized above in claim 1. In this regard, neither involves “encoding the document with the information” as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

With respect to claim 15, Applicants have amended that claim to recite:

15. A communications system, comprising:
a document-sending system configured to:
determine whether a user sent a copy of a document created by an application other than an email application and attached to an email message to a first set of at least one recipient via email; and
encode the document with information comprising an email address to which the document was sent via email so that a copy of a revised version of the document can be sent automatically to the email address as an attachment to another email message without the user accessing the email application, if the user sent the copy of the document to the at least one recipient of the first set as an email attachment using an email application.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully assert that the references are legally deficient for the purpose of rendering claim 15 unpatentable. In particular, Applicants respectfully assert that the cited references, either individually or in combination, do not teach or reasonably suggest at least the features/limitations emphasized above in claim 15. In this regard, neither involves to “encode the document with information comprising an email address to which the document was sent via email” as recited in claim 15. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 15 is in condition for allowance.

With respect to claim 22, Applicants have amended that claim to recite:

22. A tangible computer-readable medium storing a computer program for sending documents, the computer-readable medium comprising:
logic configured to determine whether a user sent a copy of a document created by an application other than an email application and attached to an email message to a first set of at least one recipient via email; and
logic configured to append information, comprising an email address to which the document was set via email, to the document so that a copy of a revised version of the document can be sent automatically attached to another email message to the email address without the user accessing the email application, wherein the logic correlates the information if the user sent the

copy of the document to the at least one recipient of the first set as an email attachment using an email application.
(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully assert that the references are legally deficient for the purpose of rendering claim 22 unpatentable. In particular, Applicants respectfully assert that the cited references, either individually or in combination, do not teach or reasonably suggest at least the features/limitations emphasized above in claim 22. In this regard, neither involves to “append information, comprising an email address to which the document was set via email, to the document” as recited in claim 22. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 22 is in condition for allowance.

With respect to claim 28, Applicants have amended that claim to recite:

28. A method for sending information via email, comprising:
creating a file using an application other than an email application;
attaching the file to an email message as a first email attachment;
designating a first recipient to receive the email message with the first email attachment; and
encoding the file with information corresponding to an email address to which the email message was sent via email so that a revised version of the file is automatically sent to the first recipient, at the email address encoded with the file, as a second email attachment via a subsequent email in response to the file being revised using the application.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully assert that the references are legally deficient for the purpose of rendering claim 28 unpatentable. In particular, Applicants respectfully assert that the cited references, either individually or in combination, do not teach or reasonably suggest at least the features/limitations emphasized above in claim 28. In this regard, neither involves “encoding the file with information corresponding to an email address to which the email message was sent via email” as recited in claim 28. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 28 is in condition for allowance.

With respect to the rejection of dependent claims 3, 4, 6 – 14, 16 – 21, 23 – 27, 29 and 30, Applicants respectfully assert that none of the references or combinations thereof, teaches

or reasonably suggests at least the features/limitations emphasized above in independent claims 1, 15, 22 and 28. That is, neither *Naylor* nor *Nielsen* teaches or reasonably suggests at least the features/limitations emphasized above in independent claims 1, 15, 22 and 28 that are lacking in *Baker* and *Krueger*. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that the aforementioned dependent claims are in condition for allowance because they incorporate all the features/limitations of their respective independent claims. Additionally, these claims recite other features/limitations that can serve as an independent basis for patentability.


Cited Art Made of Record

The cited art made of record has been considered, but is not believed to affect the patentability of the presently pending claims.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.


Respectfully submitted,



David R. Risley, Reg. No. 39,345

**THOMAS, KAYDEN,
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**
Suite 1750
100 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on 10/5/05.


Signature